

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by St. Louis University. Subscription price: \$1.00 a Year.
Entered as second-class matter at St. Louis, Mo., Post-Office.

Vol. XV

APRIL, 1939

No. 7

Mary Magdalene in Easter Hymnody

BY SISTER M. PALMYRE, I. H. M.
Marygrove College

Mary Magdalene will ever be a character inspiring hope and confidence in fallen man, for her sins, numerous and grave, were the paradoxical means of her glory. That Latin hymnologists felt the appeal of her story is evidenced by the many poems written in her honor. The most famous and familiar of these is the paschal sequence *Victimae paschali laudes*, one of the five sequences used in the Missal. It is generally ascribed to Wipo, chaplain at the court of Conrad II, about 1050.

Victimae paschali laudes immolent Christiani.
Agnus redemit oves: Christus innocens Patri reconciliavit peccatores.
Mors et vita duello conflixere mirando: dux vitae mortuus regnat vivus.
Die nobis, Maria, quid vidisti in via?
Sepulchrum Christi viventis: et gloriam vidi resurgentis.
Angelicos testes, sudarium et vestes.
Surrexit Christus, spes mea: praecedet vos in Galilaeam.
Scimus Christum surrexisse a mortuis vere: Tu nobis, victor, Rex, miserere.

Apart from other points of a definite poetic value, such as, beginning with the fourth line, the caesura and internal double rhyme, we notice the vital force of the question-and-answer presentation, a dramatic element that is in accord with the trend of the Church in the Middle Ages to enact the liturgy.¹ In order to vivify the story of the Resurrection, the altar would be considered as the Tomb of Christ. Different actors were chosen for the characters of Mary and the angels. The latter would stand near the altar as though guarding the Tomb while Mary would approach and look searchingly for the Body of Christ. It was an effective way of impressing the liturgy of the Church upon the minds of her children.

Another Easter hymn figuring Mary Magdalene is the *Pone luctum, Magdalena*, which is sometimes ascribed to Adam of St. Victor (d. c. 1172).

Pone luctum, Magdalena,
Et serena lacrimas;
Non est iam Simonis cena,
Non cur fletum exprimas;
Causae mille sunt laetandi,
Causae mille exultandi:
Alleluia resonet.

Sume risum, Magdalena,
Frons nitescat lucida;
Demigravit omnis poena,
Lux coruscat fulgida;
Christus mundum liberavit,
Et de morte triumphavit:
Alleluia resonet.

Gaude, plaude, Magdalena,
Tumba Christus exiit,
Tristis est peracta scena,
Victor mortis rediit;
Quem deflebas morientem,
Nunc arride resurgentem:
Alleluia resonet.

Tolle vultum, Magdalena,
Redivivum obstupe;
Vide frons quam sit amoena,
Quinque plagas aspice;
Fulgent sicut margaritae,
Ornamenta novae vitae:
Alleluia resonet.

Vive, vive, Magdalena,
Tua lux reversa est;
Gaudiis turgescat vena,
Mortis vis abtersa est;
Maesti procul sunt dolores,
Laeti redeant amores:
Alleluia resonet.

The classically trained reader, whose ears are attuned to beautiful sound, will at once see what means the poet employs to produce this perfect revel of sonorous sound effects. The keynote is expressed in his refrain: *Alleluia resonet!* How much joy and hope, how much buoyancy and confidence he has succeeded in compressing into seemingly simple words! The effect upon the reader is overpowering, for, although the words were spoken to *Magdalena* long ago, the reader whose faith in the Risen Christ is the same as hers, imperceptibly hears them addressed to his own soul:

Pone luctum, Magdalena!
Sume risum, Magdalena!
Gaude, plaude, Magdalena!
Vive, vive, Magdalena!

Not so well known but of equally charming quality is the *Pange, lingua, Magdalena*, attributed to Philippe de Grève, a contemporary of Adam of St. Victor. The opening line is an imitation of one of the stateliest poems of all Latin hymnody: *Pange, lingua, gloriosi lauream certaminis* of Fortunatus (530-609). Raby remarks² that there was "no more admirable rhythmical poem . . . produced in France during the Thirteenth century." Philippe de Grève had an understanding of rhythmical verse and rhyme, which at times rose to truly lyrical quality. His art is well seen in the grace of form and warmth of emotion:

Pange, lingua, Magdalena,
lacrimas et gaudium,
Sonent voces laude plenae
de concentu cordium,
Ut concordet philomenae
turturis suspirium.

The contrasting *lacrimas* and *gaudium*, both so typical of Mary Magdalene, are the two key words developed in the poem. The poet would sing of Mary's sorrow and joy with the sweet harmony of the nightingale and the turtledove, probably symbolic, respectively, of Christ and Magdalena.

She did not blush at the disturbance caused as she sought Jesus among the guests. She cleanses in a river of tears His unwashed feet, and He washes away her sin and guilt:

Jesum quaerens, convivarum
turbas non erubuit;

Pedes unxit, lacrimarum
fluvio quos abluit,
Crine tersit et culparum
lacrimum promeruit.

This is a good example of word position effecting thought emphasis. The reader by glancing at the first word of each verse (*Jesum, pedes, crine*) has a summary of the content of the stanza. The next two stanzas are fruitful sources for thought, but the inherent appeal of the original cannot be fully conveyed in a translation. A paraphrase runs thus: "Mary washed the One Who cleansed her. The fountain of her tears mingled with the water of God's grace. Heaven gave dew to earth; earth rained tears on heaven." In the outpouring of the precious mixture of spikenard, Mary mystically typifies a woman sick with sin, anointing her physician in order to be cured by His anointing:

Suum lavit mundatorem,
rivo fons immaduit,
Pium fudit fons liquorem
et in ipsum refluit,
Caelum terrae dedit rorem,
terra caelum conpluit.

In praedulci mixtione
nardum ferens pisticum,
In unguenti fusione
typum gessit mysticum,
Ut sanetur unctione,
unxit aegra medicum.

Only in the *Pange, lingua*, is mention made of Christ's looking at Mary *speciali gratia*, and because she loved much, all was forgiven her. The last lines speak of her as the messenger of the Resurrection. The final stanza offers honor and glory to God, the *paschalis hostia, victor die tertia*:

Pie Christus hanc respexit
speciali gratia;
Quia multum hunc dilexit,
dimittuntur omnia;
Christi, quando resurrexit,
facta est praenuntia.
Gloria et honor Deo
qui, paschalis hostia,
Agnus mente, pugna leo,
victor die tertia
Resurrexit cum tropaeo
mortis ferens spolia.

O Maria, noli flere, retaining the same rhyme scheme as the *Pange, lingua, Magdalena*, but with greater beauty of thought, is another Easter poem by the same author. The directness with which Latin hymns can express uplifting thoughts, yet through accentual verse lose nothing of rhythm, is here well exemplified. The *O Maria, noli flere* plays on the idea of Christ, the gardener, referring to Him in the opening stanzas as *hortulanus . . . et colonus mentium*. The poet bids Mary seek Him in the garden of her mind:

O Maria, noli flere,
iam non quaeras alium;
Hortulanus hic est vere
et colonus mentium;
Intra mentis hortum quaere
mentis operarium.

The theme of the selection is fairly well summed up in the last two lines of the second stanza: "You seek Jesus Whom you have found but do not know." The fourth stanza brings out the tender thought that she did not know her Master while He was sowing the seed, *verbum*

Christi, but now the Word pours more light upon her and to His "Mary" she answers "Rabboni." This is the dramatic climax of the poem:

Iam non miror, si nescisti
magistrum, dum seminat;
Semen, quod est verbum Christi,
te magis illuminat;
Et Rabboni respondisti,
dum Mariam nominat.

Then follows an invocation to the saint begging that we may share with her the glory of the Risen One. Just as the *Pange, lingua* and the *Pone luctum* refer to Magdalene at the house of Simon, so the *O Maria, noli flere* in its final stanza refers to the banquet of the Pharisee and the *cena vitae*, which Christ gave to the sinner made saint.

¹ For a version of the *Victimae* with the dramatic portion expanded, see B. C. Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Macmillan, 1874); p. 160.

² Raby, F. J. E., *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginning to the Close of the Middle Ages* (Clarendon, 1927); p. 399.

Cicero's Speed of Delivery

By WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER
University of California

It is always interesting to try to re-create a great figure of the past under his or her several aspects. The possibility of doing this depends, apart from mere rambles of the imagination, on the material available. In consequence much has been done for Cicero, about whom so much is known, thanks in no small degree to himself. An engaging point in regard to him is this: how fast did he talk? Was Cicero a "whirlwind" orator?

Despite Quintilian's claim in the first chapter of his tenth book that Seneca's influence had ruined the style of the young men of his time by drawing them after him and away from genuine Ciceronianism, much of Seneca's work is written in a perfectly "sound" Ciceronian manner, and it will hardly be disputed that Seneca knew Cicero's works well, and was also well informed, at reasonably close range, too, on all the traditions attaching to the Roman Demosthenes. Therefore any observations on Cicero made by Seneca, himself an orator of great distinction and in his school days only half a century removed from the year of Cicero's death, are bound to be instructive.

For the purposes of this brief article I wish to focus attention on Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*, XL, 11: "Cicero quoque noster, a quo Romana eloquentia exiit, gradarius fuit." What did Seneca mean by *gradarius*? Reference to the Thesaurus shows how rare the word is in the Latin known to us, but, as luck will have it, of the two examples quoted of its literal use, one is distinctly helpful, viz., Lucilius, 476: "Ipse ecus non formosus, gradarius, optimus vector." Lipsius, commenting on the Senecan passage mentioned above, quotes this line of Lucilius and says: "gradarius fuit (sc. Cicero), non cursor: gradu ivit." In short, Cicero was no race-horse, but, as Summers (*Select Letters of Cicero*, p. 205) renders it, a "steady goer," referring us to the definition of the word in Nonius: *molli gradu et sine succussatura* (jolting) *nitens*.

Seneca's remark on Cicero must be considered in its context. He has been recommending his correspondent not to pay attention to those *qui quantum dicant, non quemadmodum quaerunt*. He says that if it is necessary to choose one extreme or the other, he would prefer a speaker like Vinicius who couldn't utter three words consecutively above Haterius. "Nam Q. Hateri cursum, suis temporibus oratoris celeberrimi, longe abesse ab homine sano volo: numquam dubitavit, numquam intermisit; semel incipiebat, semel desinebat. Quaedam tamen et nationibus puto magis aut minus convenire: in Graecis hanc licentiam tuleris; nos etiam cum scribimus, interpungere adsuescimus." Then comes the description of Cicero as a *gradarius*. We have, therefore, decisively answered one of the two questions posed in our first paragraph; Cicero was not a "whirlwind" orator, sweeping people off their feet and out of their senses. He evidently followed a middle way (as in his politics, Mommsen's ghost would say).

What does Cicero himself offer about the question of speed in oratory? Without going into too elaborate an enquiry we may refer to *Ad M. Brutum Orator*, XVI, 52-53: "Cum est oratio mollis et tenera et ita flexibilis, ut sequatur quocumque torqueas, tum et naturae variae et voluntates multum inter se distantia effecerunt genera dicendi: flumen aliis verborum volubilitasque cordi est, qui ponunt in orationis celeritate eloquentiam; distincta alios et interpuncta intervalla, morae respirationesque delectant. Quid potest esse tam diversum? tamen est in utroque aliquid excellens." The last sentence shows Cicero once again taking the very sensible middle way. There is the occasion for a *flumen verborum*, a "full tide of eloquence," when the auditor is amazed at your *mobilitas linguae* (*De Oratore*, I, 28, 127), but also the call for "clearly marked and pointed breaks." There is a mean between those who "delight in pauses and intervals for taking breath" (or, as with our modern eloquence, copious draughts of water) and those who "base eloquence on the speed of the delivery."

But, of course, speed of delivery is a relative term. If we go back to the longer Senecan passage quoted above, we see that the Romans found that the Greeks as a race talked, for the most part, in the manner of Haterius: *semel incipiebat, semel desinebat*, "he never drew breath from start to finish." I am of the opinion that most of us would feel the same way about Roman oratory could we be confronted with a resurrected example of it, namely, that it was rather fast moving, but could be tolerated in a foreigner. I base this idea on numerous experiences in listening to Italian orators, and listening with critical attention because of a deep personal interest in observing and practising various speeds of delivery. Cicero's steady going (*gradu ire*) would be fairly fast travelling for most of us.

In fact, I think we ordinarily read our Latin (that is, if we do really read it aloud and are not content with merely visualizing it) far too slowly; there is always present, it would seem, the tendency to hang on the "blessed words." I am sure I would shock many of you by my quick getaway at *Quousque tandem* and the speed I maintained on the highway thereafter. But the effect on a class is electric; they find it exciting, as of course

it was, but not when delivered like a graveside address.

My conclusion is then as follows. Judging from the Latins of the modern world, after having heard a good deal of very competent French and Italian oratory and some Spanish, I am convinced that the tempo of the Latin oratory of the past was considerably above that usually employed for oratory in English, and that, while Cicero was reckoned a "steady goer," yet the truth would still be that to our ears he would seem to be getting over the ground pretty quickly. I estimate, for example, that twenty-five to thirty minutes (and nearer the former than the latter) would suffice for the First Catilinarian, and I am confirmed in that view by reflecting that it would be difficult to maintain such a torrent of abuse effectively for longer than that time. I would surmise that the *De Imperio* took about an hour to deliver. After all, there were other speeches that day, and not even ancient audiences could or would listen to very many hours of eloquence on end. The *mobilitas linguae* of *De Oratore*, I, 28, 127, was prized because the orator would be travelling at high speed which could not be maintained unless the running parts were functioning smoothly. I am quite aware that my figures just given for the First Catilinarian and the *De Imperio* will seem at first sight sheer madness. Such a view, however, would, I suspect, be based on (1) the length of time it took each of us to read these speeches when we struck them first, (2) the length of time it has taken us to teach other people to read them. But the speeches in question were not school exercises; they were burning contributions to an agitated political life. And there I rest my case.

Since learning and wonder are pleasant, artistic imitation must be pleasant; for example, painting, sculpture, and poetry.—*Aristotle*

"Teaching First-Year Latin"

Teaching First-Year Latin, edited by Victor D. Hill, Dorothy M. Seeger, and Bertha M. Winch, is a revision of the *Bulletin on First-Year Latin*, published under the same auspices and by the same editors in 1930. The earlier work was reviewed by Fr. Hugh P. O'Neill, S. J., in the CLASSICAL BULLETIN VII (March, 1931), p. 45, to whose appraisal, generally commendatory and congratulatory in a high degree, one may profitably refer the interested reader; for, the purport and purpose of the revised edition and the earlier work are the same. "Some major and many minor changes," as the editors point out, "have been made both in the main text and in the bibliographies and the book as a whole has been considerably enlarged." Yet its bulk is in no sense great; it is attractively bound, well printed, and of convenient size (Pp. xvi + 280). The editors of *Teaching First-Year Latin* have no intention of foisting any one set of procedure upon their readers; in fact, they state that there will be disagreement from time to time even among the contributors to the study. The book has an assured place among American contributions on method and content in high-school Latin. Address: The Ohio Latin Service Committee, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

W. C. KORFMACHER.

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August and September by
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Subscription price: \$1.00 a year

Entered as second-class matter, at the post-office at St. Louis,
Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S. J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S. J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.
A. A. Jacobsmeyer, S. J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.
Joseph A. Walsh, S. J. Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio
F. A. Sullivan, S. J. St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Francis X. Entz, S. J. St. Charles College, Grand Coteau, La.
Chas. J. Walsh, S. J. Sacred Heart Novitiate, Los Gatos, Cal.
Daniel P. Meagher, S. J. Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.
Carol L. Bernhardt, S. J. Weston College, Weston, Mass.

BUSINESS EDITOR

J. P. Jelinek, S. J. St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Vol. XV

APRIL, 1939

No. 7

Editorial

The name of Vergil is "symbolic of poetry and of Rome. Rarely, if ever, has any poet been so universally admired, studied, and loved." It is no surprise, therefore, to learn that the great bimillennium blossomed, in 1937, into the formation of "The Vergilian Society," and brought into life a magazine (called *Vergilius*) "devoted exclusively to Vergilian research and to articles and papers dealing with the topography and archaeology of places associated with Vergil and his poetry." Papers of "an aesthetic and appreciative nature" will also be presented. Chairman of the American Committee of the Society and Editor of its "Bulletin" is Professor E. L. Highbarger, of Northwestern University. The first number was published late in the spring of 1937, the second has just appeared. The subscription price, which includes membership in the Society, is one dollar. All success to *Vergilius* and its Editor!

It is interesting to see how a well-known Vergilian scholar, W. F. J. Knight, analyzes one cause of the fascination of Vergil. We quote the opening paragraph from his paper entitled "The Holy City of the East in Vergil": "The bewildering force and depth of Vergil's poetry forever challenge new explanations. One possible explanation, accounting for something if not for everything, is this. Vergil beyond other poets, had a strange sense of the past in the present, and sometimes of a very distant past indeed. Pent up in his poetry is the experience not of his day alone, and not even of a few generations before him besides. Nor does he read the further past by superficial records merely. He has a sensitivity to know what mattered to men in far distant days, and he retains within him some of their sight, and some of their hope and fear."

The January number of *The Classical Journal* contains an interesting article entitled "Further Reflections on the Forgotten Student," by Dr. Mary B. McElwain, of Smith College, whose well-known enthusiasm for the

classics is contagious. In the present turmoil of "education" everything is being thought of by our "educators," from preparing the student for "complete living" down to teaching him how to "wash dishes." One thing only is forgotten—the student who comes to us for a liberal education. An unobtrusive footnote reminds us that a student is "one who acquires knowledge by effort, who meditates, who fixes the mind closely on a subject." One is amazed to see in what a deluge of educational "experiments" the mind of the modern American child is being drowned. Dr. McElwain closes her survey with this significant verdict:

The experiments of these past years have not proved, according to the evidence submitted, that in passing from the traditional curriculum to modern methods and subjects of education, we have found in the new that knowledge that "is of most worth." And the objects of these experiments may well have a grievance at having been deprived of that discipline which is "necessary to the human soul" and of that education which "the best judgment of the centuries has agreed to be of permanent value."

It is well for us who teach Latin again and again to be reminded of the rich possibilities of the study of that language as an instrument of mental training. We are also ready from time to time to listen to a much-needed warning (such as was sounded in the CLASSICAL BULLETIN for March, in an incisive paper on Cicero) that "the mere exposure" of a group of secondary-school pupils to Latin, were it even the Latin of a Cicero, "will not automatically confer the benefits of mind-training. There is an absolute need for a master who will supervise and train in the method best calculated to produce the desired result." We therefore recommend "What Latin can do," printed in this issue, and call attention to Fr. O'Neill's excellent "Reasons for Electing Latin in College," published in the CLASSICAL BULLETIN for June, 1938. A really first-rate book dealing with language in general as the supreme instrument of education is *Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method in School* by S. S. Laurie (Edinburgh: Thin; 1893).

Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. announce "the long-awaited revision" of *Bradley's Arnold Latin Prose Composition*—a book that has brought up generations of English-speaking students, many of whom are now teachers of Latin. The revision is by J. F. Mountford. To quote from the announcement: "The most obvious need for revision lay in the enunciation of grammatical rules and in the explanation of the nature of Latin usages . . . The orthography has been modernized, also, and quantity marks placed over long vowels . . . Here and there the angularities in the English sentences have been smoothed away and occasionally modified into speech uttered by a rational human being." There is an Appendix, containing Preliminary Hints and Passages for Translation, with, of course, a Vocabulary. Pages viii + 443. Price \$2.00.

Tu nil invita dices faciesve Minerva.

In the minds of its loudest advocates, everything that is merely external and subsidiary is a fit object for "research," while the study of the things themselves is the province of the *littérateur* and the *dilettante*.—John Burnet

Cicero's Orations

By P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Cicero's extant discourses are distributed among his appearances before either the courts (26), or the senate (19), or public meetings (10), or Caesar as dictator (2), or the pontifical college (1). Seven of these were never spoken: the fivefold argument against Verres, the defence of Milo, and the second *Philippic* against Antony. Of these 58 surviving speeches one-half pertain to political problems and of the other half 4 contest civil cases and 25 concern criminal charges. Eight of the orations occupied with criminal causes are classed in the category of *actio secunda*, which is an additional pleading pronounced after an adjournment (*comperendinatio*) and which examines the evidence of witnesses elicited after the set speech (*perpetua oratio*) of the *actio prima*. It is coincidental that these specimens all come from suits concerned with propraetorian maladministration in provinces and were composed for use in the *quaestio de pecuniis repetundis*, to which court such charges were carried.¹

Beside these complete or comparatively intact orations² there are found both fragments and titles of discourses which otherwise have disappeared. The latest collection of this corpus is in F. Schoell's edition of *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationum Deperditarum Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1917) published in the Teubner series of Cicero's works.

Schoell submits 23 speeches which survive solely in 227 fragments (varying in length from 1 to 105 words) or in 32 short summaries of sections in these speeches, all of which have been accurately apportioned among these addresses.³ There are also 33 fragments of whose proper place among Cicero's orations there is decided doubt.⁴ Though no *ipsissima verba* remain from 3 of these discourses (*De Proscriptorum Liberis*, *De Consulatu Suo*, *Pro P. Vatinius*), yet there have been preserved brief and detached paraphrases of what Cicero said in certain parts of these speeches and thus these orations are commonly counted by editors with those extant only in fragments. The 23 discourses may be divided on the basis of the number of fragments found, taking 10 citations as the criterion. In order, then, those speeches showing above 10 quotations are: *Pro C. Cornelio Prima* (61 fragments and 2 paraphrases), *In P. Clodium Pulchrum et C. Scribonium Curionem* (33 f.), *In Toga Candida contra C. Antonium Hybridam et L. Sergium Catilinam* (28 f.), *Interrogatio de Aere Alieno T. Annii Milonis Papiani* (25 f.), *Pro L. Varenio* (11 f. and 8 p.), *Pro C. Cornelio Secunda* (18 f.), *Pro P. Oppio Prima* (6 f. and 7 p.),⁵ *De Rege Alexandrino* (11 f. and 2 p.), *Contra Contionem Q. Caecili Metelli Nepotis* (10 f.). The remaining 14 orations offer less than 10 fragments and paraphrases a piece. Most of the excerpts from and the evidence for these discourses comes from Cicero himself (divided about evenly between his correspondence and his other published works), Q. Asconius Pedianus (who for his children's benefit commented on the *cruces* in Cicero's orations), Quintilian (who culled from Cicero's speeches a mass of material for his monumental *Institutio Oratoria*), Arusianus Messius (who

wrote a phrase-book preserving many passages from Cicero's lost works), and the several Scholiasts on Cicero's speeches.

According to Schoell there are also 37 orations of which only their titles have survived.⁶ Among these, however, are 4 speeches which were suspected to be spurious even in antiquity and which the editor excludes. Two are of special interest: *Pro L. Sergio Catilina* and *Laudatio C. Iulii Caesaris*. There is no doubt that Cicero considered a defence of Catiline in 65 (*Att.* 1.2.1), before the latter's celebrated conspiracy burst upon the city, but that Cicero did defend Catiline (as is sometimes stated) we shall never know with certainty. The *Laudatio Caesaris* seems to have been the composition which Cicero calls his palinode or recantation, in which he sent his submission to the First Triumvirate (*Att.* 4.5.1). Since the title is late and since there is no extra evidence for such a distinct document dated in 56, intermittently for generations investigators have waged a wordy war over the identification of this palinode with one of Cicero's published works. If the *Laudatio* must be linked with a known Ciceronian composition, then the common choice is between the orations *De Provinciis Consularibus* and *Pro L. Cornelio Balbo*, with the former as the favorite. But it is not certain whether the palinode was ever published, for it may very well have been merely a verbal communication with either Caesar or Pompey pronounced in person or transmitted through a friend. This is the current consensus among those who have made the most recent research on the recantation.⁷ The other dubious discourses are those entitled *Pro Q. Mucio Orestino* and *Si Eum P. Clodius Pulcher Legibus Interrogasset*. Asconius assailed Fenestella, his older contemporary, for fathering the first oration on Cicero and a Scholiast suggested that the second speech was composed after Cicero's death. We have, then, a net count of 33 authentic addresses known by title to the latest editor. Of interest among these may be mentioned: the discourse *De Pace* delivered, on 17 March 44, in the Temple of Tellus and given in Greek by Dio Cassius (44.23-33); the eulogy for the son of Serranus Domesticius, which Cicero furnished in 54 for his friend's use at the funeral (*Q.F.* 3.6[8].5);⁸ and the *Edictum L. Racili Tr. Pl.*, which Cicero composed in 57 for Racilius as an invective against Clodius (cf. *Q.F.* 2.1.2).⁸

In fine, then, adding to the extant orations those known from fragments and through title, we have, according to Schoell's edition, excellent evidence for 114 orations of Cicero. But more than these 114 are known to have existed. In 1913 Professor John E. Granrud of the University of Minnesota published "A Preliminary List of Cicero's Orations,"⁹ in which he arrived at a total of 153. Before he prepared his "provisional list,—the first one of its kind," so far as he knew, the greatest total of genuine orations was given as 108. Granrud claimed "no discoveries" and hoped that he "was guilty of no inventions" in attributing 45 additional addresses to Cicero. The new speeches in his list, he held, were "well known to every scholar who is thoroughly familiar with the life of Cicero." Granrud concluded his introductory remarks by admitting that "additions and cor-

rections will be necessary" and by welcoming suggestions for his final register, which he did not live to rearrange and which no one yet (apparently) has cared to complete. It is true that Granrud gave signal service to the question of what orations Cicero composed, but it is regrettable that the limits of space left for his study did not permit him to print the references whither he repaired for those speeches of which every evidence save their subject has escaped us. While Granrud omits the *Pro Catilina* and the *Si Eum P. Clodius Legibus Interrogasset*, he includes the *Laudatio Caesaris* and the *Pro Mucio*,—all of which Schoell supposes either never existed or not genuine. Some of the new speeches given by Granrud stand on slippery ground. To take only one (for there is not time to argue about his additions): the ascription to Cicero of an oration *Pro L. Sempronio Atriatino Patre* (no. 7 in his list) is assailed by R. G. Austin in his recent edition of Cicero's *Pro M. Caelio Rufo*. Although Austin admits that "the word *beneficium* in § 7 [of the *Pro Caelio*] may imply that the latter [Cicero] had defended him [Atratinus] in some suit . . . Yet there is no evidence that Cicero ever delivered a speech on behalf of a Sempronius Atratinus."¹⁰ On the other hand, Granrud has attracted attention to *De Lege Agraria Oratio Quarta* of 63 (*Att.* 2.13) and to *In M. Antonium Oratio Philippica Quinta Decima* of 43 (fragments have been found for the 16th *Philippic*, so we must assume the existence of the 15th).¹¹ Thus, a definitive and documented list of Cicero's defective discourses is still desired.

As aids to the appreciation of Cicero's orations we have much material of different degrees of value and many special studies on the several speeches. Among the more recent general researches in English may be mentioned those of M. Radin, *Literary References in Cicero's Orations* in *Classical Journal* 6 (1910-1911) 209-217; J. E. Granrud, *Was Cicero Successful in the Art Oratorical?* in *Classical Journal* 8 (1912-1913) 234-243; N. W. DeWitt, *Litigation in the Forum in Cicero's Time* in *Classical Philology* 21 (1926) 218-224; M. B. Peaks, *Cicero and American Lawyers* in *Classical Journal* 22 (1926-1927) 563-577; E. A. Lussky, *The Appeal to the Emotions in the Judicial Speeches of Cicero* (Minneapolis 1928). For the advanced student still unsurpassed is A. H. J. Greenidge's *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time* (Oxford 1901) and to this may be added E. Costa's *Cicerone giureconsulto* (2 vols., 2nd ed., Bologna 1927). On the subject of style there is the book by J. Lebreton, S. J., *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris 1901), which Tyrrell and Purser considered "undoubtedly one of the most learned, judicious, and attractive works on Latin style we have ever read."¹² Nor must one omit to mention the zeal of T. Zielinski, who has contributed so successfully to Ciceronian studies, especially in his *Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden* and *Der konstruktive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden* (Leipzig 1904-1914). Less technical and more readable than Zielinski's researches are most of the authoritative articles of L. Laurand in his *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron* (3 vols., 2nd-4th ed., Paris 1925-1936), which is a magnificent monument to Ciceronianism. And underlying the work of these scholars is H. Merguet's

invaluable *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero* (4 vols., Jena 1877-1884).

In studying Cicero's speeches it goes without saying that the student should acquaint himself with the technical aspects of the addresses which he is reading: date, place of delivery, subject or controversy, state of speech, structure, prosecutor and defendant and their lawyers, verdict or result, language and style. Beside these there are general points which call for consideration: previous history of the case or of the subject, points of law involved, legal procedure, political aspects, conduct of the case, Cicero's motives, Cicero's attitude, Cicero's professional ethics, importance of the oration both in antiquity and today. These topics doubtless must be discussed by the teacher of students in preparatory schools, but in the case of college students brief reports on such subjects should be required from members of the class and, if time permits, should be presented in class and there criticized by the instructor.

¹ In C. Verrem *Actio Secunda* (in 5 parts), *Pro M. Fonteio*, *Pro L. Valerio Flacco*, *Pro M. Aemilio Scauro*.

² With those discourses which are defective in a slight degree editors generally give what fragments have been found belonging to them (e.g., the 10 fragments from the *In Pisonem*). Again, in some cases we come upon citations from certain speeches which are not now in them (e.g., the 2 fragments from the *Philippics*: one from the 4th and one from the 14th). None of these excerpts of either class is counted among the 227 fragments and the 32 paraphrases found for the 23 orations mentioned in the next paragraph.

³ Schoell furnishes the fragments and the evidence for 19 in pp. 392-466, for the 20th and the 21st in pp. 485-487, for the 22nd in pp. 488-492, and for the 23rd on p. 390. His conspectus on p. 494 lists only 18 *en bloc*; but, as the 3rd entry among the 18 contains fragments of 2 orations for Oppius, the true total is 19. There are also 3 paraphrases (pp. 424-425) placed with the 2 orations for Cornelius (nos. 7 and 8 among the 18) and no one knows from which of these speeches they survive.

⁴ In pp. 467-471.

⁵ From the second speech for Oppius only one word remains.

⁶ In pp. 471-484 are given 31; the 32nd is on p. 485, the 33rd is on p. 487, the 34th is on p. 488, and the 35th-37th are in pp. 492-493.

⁷ So C. Saunders in *Classical Philology* 14 (1919) 201-215 and T. R. Holmes in *Classical Quarterly* 14 (1920) 39-45.

⁸ Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* 3.8.50) tells us that Cicero occasionally composed orations for others.

⁹ *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 44 (1913) xxvii-xxx.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 117 (Oxford 1933).

¹¹ How many *Philippics* Cicero pronounced is still a problem. There are 14 extant and we find from Cicero (*Fam.* 12.7.1) that between the 11th and the 12th the tribune M. Servilius introduced Cicero to a *contio*, where his harangue was hailed *tanto clamore consensuque populi, ut nihil unquam simile viderim*. Granrud omits this oration. We hear also of a 16th and a 17th, for Arusianus Messius furnishes a fragment for each. But the textual tradition is not secure for the second which belongs to the 17th, since certain codices confer it upon the 16th. In commenting on this condition H. Keil, the last editor of Arusianus, concludes: "Ciceronis verba ex Philippicis orationibus citata unde petita sint, non constat" (*Grammatici Latini*, VII. 467 [Leipzig 1880]).

¹² *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, II. lxx (2nd ed., Dublin 1906).

But we have to consider that English is an immensely odd and irregular language, that it is accounted very difficult by even the best foreign linguists, and that even among native writers there are few who can so wield it as to make their meaning clear without prolixity—and among these few none who has not been well-grounded in Latin.—*Max Beerbohm*

Greek Poetry in Translation

Those who are familiar with *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse* will find the English versions of all the pieces contained in that splendid collection, as lately published under the editorship of Messrs. Higham and Bowra, extremely interesting. (*The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*, edited by T. F. Higham and C. M. Bowra, Oxford University Press, New York, 1938: \$3.) In the 108-page Introduction, Mr. Bowra neatly discusses "the Character and Development of Greek Poetry" and Mr. Higham "Greek Poetry in Translation." The second and by far longer part of the introduction is a fine, compact, and comprehensive treatise on the nature of translation in general, the problems of meaning and form in translating poetry, the practice of translation and main schools of translators, the language of Greek as compared with the language of English poetry, Greek verse forms in English adaptations, and the translation of Greek poetry into English prose. The insight, breadth, and sanity of this little treatise on translation cannot be too highly recommended. All teachers of Greek and of the classics ought to read it. Though Mr. Higham confesses at the end (eviii) "as well write an Art of Poetry as an Art of Translation," his contribution to the subject is nevertheless very stimulating and helpful. And even if, as he says in the same introduction (xlvi), "translation can only hope to produce analogous results by means of true poetry or prose that is akin to poetry," still the fact remains that for the vast majority of educated men translation is the only means of acquiring any acquaintance with Greek poetry. Hence the book before us represents a most laudable undertaking, for which many, especially the Greekless, will be grateful. It is both more comprehensive and more discerning than any previously published anthology of Greek poetry in English. Besides Messrs. Higham's and Bowra's own versions, which are numerous and generally of high excellence, versions by all the famous English translators of the classics are here represented: Browning, Byron, Chapman, Cowper, Herrick, Housman, Ben Jonson, Lang, Leaf, Mackail, Marris, Thomas Moore, William Morris, Gilbert Murray, Pater, Phillimore, Pope, Rossetti, Shelley, Swinburne, Tennyson, Way, etc. Still, when all has been said and done, one lays down even so excellent an anthology as this with a deeper realization than ever that poetry is, after all, untranslatable. If you would really know Greek poetry, learn Greek. There is no other way. Gilbert Murray's "The sons of Erechtheus, the olden" and Plumptre's "Creep, ivy, ever gently creep" are exquisite; but they are only "analogous" to the originals.

F. A. P.

It has even been argued with some plausibility that it [the subject-matter of ancient literature] is by no means specially adapted to youthful minds. I am very sure that it is not on any such ground that most of us in our hearts believe in classical education. We make a far higher claim for it than that. We claim that it is the best training in form, and that all education is essentially a training in form.—*John Burnet*

Cicero at Mundelein College

By SISTER MARY DONALD, B. V. M.
Mundelein College

For the past few years the only course in Cicero offered at Mundelein College has been the reading, during part of one semester, of Book I of the *Tusculan Disputations*. One year the Freshmen had half a semester in Cicero's *Letters*; another year, in the *De Senectute* and *De Amicitia*. But since then the usual Freshman course has been either a survey of Latin literature, with whatever selections from Cicero were included in the class text, or a course in Liturgical Latin, and Cicero has been left for the Juniors and Seniors. The First *Tusculan* is read in the same semester as Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. The two authors were contemporary; they were Rome's two greatest exponents of systematic philosophy; their literary media as well as their philosophical outlook and personal qualities afford an interesting—sometimes violent—contrast. The class is restricted to Juniors and Seniors, who are studying philosophy and have sufficient acquaintance with logic and the history of philosophy to read the two authors intelligently.

The method of presentation varies: Cicero has been read in the first quarter and Lucretius in the second, or vice versa; occasionally both have been read simultaneously, the comparable or contrasting passages in each being studied side by side. The method I prefer is to read the first three books of *De Rerum Natura*, and then, while Lucretius' ideas on the soul are fresh in the mind, study the First *Tusculan*. While not as much time can be given to a detailed study of Cicero's style as might be desired, it is by no means neglected, and the contributions of the two men to the Latin philosophical vocabulary is an important part of the course.

I am heartily in accord with those contributors to the *Classical Bulletin* who advocate more study of Cicero rather than less, but my problem is: where shall it be placed? Since we do not require Latin for the A. B. degree, those students who have had only two years of Latin in high school usually elect a modern language in college. This limits the enrollment in the Latin classes to those with four years of high-school Latin, many of whom have unhappy memories of their year of Cicero and no least desire to renew his acquaintance. They are eager to get on to authors they have not read before: Catullus and Horace can well fill a year's course. (I am not well satisfied with the results of a survey course for Freshmen: they do not master any author, nor even remember most of them.) More of Cicero would inevitably mean less of Horace, Vergil, Ovid, or the historians. Would this be loss or gain?

What Latin Can Do

1. Latin may be used as a means of developing word consciousness. Every Latin word has a definite meaning of which the child must become aware, and awareness of Latin meanings brings awareness of English meanings.
2. It may be used as a means of training the pupil to see. A pupil is required to observe terminations. This stops guessing at the form and compels the focus of attention. Moreover, for proper meaning, the observation must be accurate. He must observe long

marks. He is called upon constantly to exercise his powers of observation, and he begins to form habits of observation.

3. It may be used as a means of training the ears to hear. Blurred auditory images are as ineffectual as blurred visual images. Listening to commands, to instructions, is a vital part of life. Listening to oral sentences, interpreting them, is a vital part of Latin.

4. It may be used as a means of developing clear enunciation. Latin is a phonetic language. No word swallowing, no clipped forms, no dropped "g," etc. Careful speech is a necessity.

5. It may be used as a means of developing the power of attention. A pupil must attend not to one thing at a time, but to many. His attention span must take in several facts at once, and his mind must operate in several fields at the same time.

6. It may be used as a means of developing the ability to comprehend and follow instructions. He is constantly faced with a task which requires solutions, and with instructions how to proceed.

7. It may be used as a means of developing constructive habits. The pupil is learning how to get information from the printed page. He is learning to bring to his command certain skills, and to thrust from consciousness certain intruding ideas.

8. It may be used as a means of learning the process of study. Methods of attack, procedures are taken up with him from day to day.

9. It may be used as a means of learning to think. There can be no guessing. He is constantly subject to the check of proving himself right.

10. It may be used as a means of organizing his mental processes. He has learned to coordinate ear, eye, hand, and tongue. He has learned not only observation, but analysis and synthesis.

Grover Cleveland High School, N. Y.

CHARLES A. TONSOR

[Ed. Note. The "Ten Reasons" given above, which Dr. Tonsor has kindly permitted us to print, are part of a larger paper on "The Non-academically Minded Child," which is to appear elsewhere. While the process of learning is essentially the same whatever language is used as a means, Latin teachers will be willing to defend the thesis that no modern language can vie with Latin in fitness as an instrument of mental training, whether the pupil is bright or "non-academically minded."]

"The Undiscover'd Country"

(*Hamlet*, III.1.79)

The choral ode in Seneca's *Hercules Furens* (830 f.) celebrates the latest exploit of the hero in penetrating even into the land of the shades. The picture is beautifully drawn of the crowds of people, as many and as varied as those who frequent the mysteries of Demeter at the time of the autumn equinox, who tread the *via tristis* to the land of Death. A fervent wish is uttered that old age with the inevitable journey that follows may be postponed. The latest hour is still too soon for such a voyage, from which no traveller returns:

Sera nos illo referat senectus:
nemo ad id sero venit, unde nunquam,
cum semel venit, potuit reverti;
quid iuvat durum properare fatum?

This is the theme of Hamlet's famous soliloquy, if we make allowances for the Christian ideas in the later author:

There's the respect,
That makes calamity of so long life;
For who would bear the whips and scorns of time...
But that the dread of something after death,
The undiscover'd country, from whose bourn
No traveller returns,—puzzles the will.

Fordham University

JOHN J. SAVAGE

Lay Brothers

You are the hands of Christ, His calloused hands.
Blistered and horny from the saw and plane.
Before they, in their mercy, salved a pain,
They pulled a heavy boat in on the sands.
They were for use, His strong and able hands.

You are the feet of Christ, His tired feet.
Let others show His mind—you have the best.
You go rough-shod like Him upon His quest.
He had to walk on foot through sun and sleet;
Save on Palm Sunday, He employed His feet.

You are the mates of Christ, His dearest friends,
With whom He loves to sit and yarn awhile.
A working man is surest of His smile,
And He will say to you when living ends:
"Come, make yourselves at home my friends—my friends."

America (N. Y.), Jan. 14, 1939

EILEEN DUGGAN

Ad Fratres Coadiutores

Vos estis palmae Domini—callosae operando!
Serra et runcina enim cornu papulasque dederunt.
Gaudebant illae miseros relevare dolore;
Sed prius in litus navem traxere oneratam,
Artibus assuetae duris promptaeque labori.

Vos estisque pedes Domini—fessi properando!
Mentem alii doceant Domini: vos vivitis illa.
Haud molli solea, divina patrans, peragrabat.
Huic similes et vos, qui sole et frigore pagos—
Palmarum excipias Festum—pede adire solebat.

Vos estis socii Domini—carissimi amici!
Vobiscum recreat se blandis per breve tempus
Colloquiis: manibus sudanti arridet amico.
Vestrae cum vitae iam venerit hora suprema,
Dicet: 'Amici estis; mea sunt et vestra; venite.'

E Schola Campiana

A. F. GEYSER, S. J.

He who thinks that he knows enough about what he teaches, ceases from that moment to be in any sense a teacher at all.—A. W. Potts

Plato and the Age Limit

Readers of the *Classical Bulletin* may recall a note published in these columns a year ago, on "Aristotle and the Court." (January, 1938, p. 27.) Two texts from the *Politics* were cited, one reporting Hippodamus' project of a court of last appeal made up of a small number of choice old men (1267 b 39), the other attesting Aristotle's mistrust of life tenure in grave offices of state. "As the body, so the mind hath eld." (1270 b 40.)

Here on the same topic is a text yet more arresting, taken from Aristotle's master. The magistrates in this case are those who had a general surveillance over the administration by proper officials of all laws:

Let not a guardian of the laws hold office more than twenty years, nor be elected to office at less than fifty years of age. But if elected at sixty, let him rule only ten years, and so on, to the intent that if he live beyond seventy years he may no longer think to go on among these magistrates holding so great an office. (*Laws* 755 a.)

The text is not without difficulties of form which have led to various experimental emendations, as one may see in England's commentary. None of these is irresistible; and they leave its substance unaffected. What is noteworthy is the weight it gathers because it falls from the lips of Plato in his own old age, a grand old man who believed that in matters of moral wisdom old eyes were the keenest eyes of all. (715 d.)

West Baden Springs

EDGAR R. SMOTHERS, S. J.

e
e
a
l
-
f
o
s
e
e
e
e
;
-
e
o
e
J.